<center>**REMARKS**</center>

Claims 1-31 and 33-40 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Independent claims 1, 17, 21, 26 and 37-39 have been amended herein to further emphasize novel features of the invention. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 13, 37 and 38 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 13, 37 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Caid *et al.* (US 5,794,178) further in view of Cudd *et al.* (US 2004/0105127 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reason. Neither Caid *et al.* nor Cudd *et al.* teach or suggest all the elements as recited in the subject claims.

> To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, *the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations*. *See* MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not based on the Applicant's disclosure. *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The claimed invention relates a system and method to facilitate printing of web pages by employing smart techniques to allow a user to obtain a formatted version of desired content. In particular, independent claim 1 recites a system that facilitates online printing for a web user comprising an analysis component that analyzes data corresponding to a plurality of web pages, the plurality of web pages comprising at least a current web page, to facilitate identifying at least one section of the current web page; and a parsing component that dissects the current web page to remove at least one identifiable section from printable view, the at least one section determined to be non-essential to defining content of the current web page *based at least in part*

<center>10</center>

upon detecting a static section of the current webpage by comparing a prior version of the current web page to the current web page. Amended independent claims 37 and 38 recite similar features. The cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest such novel features of the subject claims.

Caid *et al.* teaches converting a user's query into a context vector to achieve more efficient searching methods for a large amount of machine-readable documents. In the Final Office Action (dated February 23, 2006), the Examiner concedes that Caid *et al.* fails to teach or suggest the parsing component of the claimed invention. Consequently, Caid *et al.* is further silent regarding a parsing component that dissects the current web page to remove at least one identifiable section from printable view, the at least one section determined to be non-essential to defining content of the current web page *based at least in part upon detecting a static section of the current webpage by comparing a prior version of the current web page to the current web page*, as afforded by amended independent claims 1, 37 and 38.

The Examiner attempts to compensate for the aforementioned deficiencies of Caid *et al.* with Cudd *et al.* Cudd *et al.* teaches a method for forming a printable representation of web pages by employing HTML frames. Cudd *et al.* allows a user to modify the dimensions of a webpage such that a print out can contain all contents of a website. While Cudd *et al.* teaches that a scroll bar within the desired content can disappear from printable view corresponding to user adjustment of webpage dimensions, nowhere does Cudd *et al.* determine that a section of a webpage is non-essential, let alone determining at least one section to *be non-essential to defining content of the current web page based at least in part upon detecting a static section of the current webpage by comparing a prior version of the current web page to the current web page*, as afforded by the claimed invention.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Caid *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* (and Brown, *et al.*), either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

II.   Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Caid *et al.*, further in view of Cudd *et al.* and further in view of Foster *et al.* (US 5,404,442). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. The

subject claim depends from claim 1, and as noted above, Caid *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* fail to teach or suggest all features of independent claim 1; and Foster *et al.* fails to compensate for their deficiencies. Thus it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

III.   Rejection of Claims 5-9, 12 and 14-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5-9, 12 and 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Caid *et al.*, further in view of Cudd *et al.* and further in view of O'Brien *et al.* (US 2004/0139169). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. The cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of the subject claims.

Claims 5-9, 12 and 14-16 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 18-20 depend from independent claim 17. As noted above, Caid *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* are silent regarding determining that at least one section is non-essential to defining content of the current web page *based at least in part upon detecting a static section of the current webpage by comparing a prior version of the current web page to the current web page.* O'Brien *et al.* fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Caid *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* O'Brien *et al* teaches identifying web fragments corresponding to portions of a web site and incorporating the fragments into a destination web site. A user manually determines whether to add selected web fragment. Nowhere does the system of O'Brien *et al.* deem a portion of the web site non-essential, let alone determine that at least one section of a document is non-essential to defining content of a current web page *based at least in part upon detecting a static section of the current webpage by comparing a prior version of the current web page to the current web page.*

Moreover, independent claim 17 recites a system that facilitates providing a preview version of a printable page comprising an attribute analysis component that analyzes data from one or more web pages, the one or more web pages comprising at least a current web page and at least one other web page; a parsing component that dissects the at least a current web page and removes at least one identifiable section from printable view; and an artificial intelligence (AI) component that performs a utility-based analysis in connection with analyzed data to automatically generate the preview version based at least in part upon *a risk involved with removing the at least one identifiable section from printable view.* As noted above with respect

to independent claim 1, O'Brien *et al.* does not determine a portion of a site to be non-essential. O'Brien *et al.* is further silent regarding generating a preview version of a printable version of a web page, let alone employing an artificial intelligence (AI) component that performs a utility-based analysis in connection with analyzed data to automatically generate the preview version based at least in part upon *a risk involved with removing the at least one identifiable section from printable view,* as afforded by independent claim 17. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV.   Rejection of Claims 10 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Caid *et al.*, further in view of Cudd *et al.* and further in view of Chakrabarti *et al.* (US 6,418,433). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Chakrabarti *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Caid *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1 (from which claims 10 and 11 depend). Thus, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

V.   Rejection of Claims 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28-31 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 21, 22, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber *et al.* (US 6,920,609) further in view of Caid *et al.* Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Neither Manber *et al.* nor Caid *et al.* teach or suggest all aspects of the subject claims.

Amended independent claim 21 recites a method that determines web page architecture to facilitate identifying content on a web page comprising providing a plurality of web pages; and analyzing the plurality of web pages to identify at least one non-essential sector to facilitate identifying content and determining location of the content on at least a subset of the web pages to facilitate generating a user-defined printable page by partitioning and removing the at least one non-essential sector from at least one current web page, *the non-essential sector is determined based at least in part by comparing a prior version of the at least one current web page to the at least one current web page to ascertain one or more portions of the at least one current web page that has remained static during updating of the at least one current web page.* As previously discussed with respect to independent claims 1, 37 and 38, Caid *et al.* is

silent regarding comparing a web page and a prior version of the same web page in determining whether a section of a web page is non-essential. Manber *et al.* fails to compensate for these deficiencies of Caid *et al.* Manber *et al.* teaches a system for analyzing HTML formatted web pages to automatically identify and extract desired information. Nowhere does Manber *et al.* teach or suggest *comparing a prior version of the at least one current web page to the at least one current web page to ascertain one or more portions of the at least one current web page that has remained static during updating of the at least one current web page* to identify a non-essential portion of a web page, as afforded by amended independent claim 21. Moreover, the cited references are further silent with regard to *disposing a thumbnail reference on a portion of the at least one current web page, the thumbnail reference provides access to a version of the at least one current web page prior to removal of the one or more sections* on a preview version of a printable web page, as afforded by amended independent claim 26. Therefore, this rejection with respect to independent claims 21 and 26 (and the claims that depend therefrom) should be withdrawn.

VI. Rejection of Claims 23, 30, 39 and 40 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 23, 30, 39 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber *et al.* further in view of Caid *et al.* and further in view of Cudd *et al.* It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. The cited references, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims.

Amended independent claim 39 recites a system that facilitates printing from a web page comprising means for providing a plurality of web pages, means for partitioning at least one of the plurality of web pages and removing at least one part of the web page from printable view; and means for analyzing the plurality of web pages to facilitate identifying content and determining location of the content on at least a subset of the web pages to facilitate generating a user-defined printable page, *the means for analyzing comprising comparing web crawler analysis of the plurality of web pages to results obtained via monitoring data from one or more feeds*. Manber *et al.,* and Caid *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* fail to teach of suggest such aspects of the claimed invention.

As discussed *supra,* Manber *et al.* teaches a system for identifying and extracting desired information from web pages. However, nowhere does Manber *et al.* facilitate the extraction process through a comparison analysis as afforded by the claimed invention, let alone *comparing web crawler analysis of the plurality of web pages to results obtained via monitoring data from one or more feeds* in order distinguish between essential and non-essential sections of a web page.

Caid *et al.* and Cudd *et al.* fail to compensate for the deficiencies of Manber *et al.* Rather, Caid *et al.* relates to converting a user's query into a context vector to achieve more efficient searching methods for a large amount of machine-readable documents, while Cudd *et al.* teaches a method for forming a printable representation of web pages by employing HTML frames. Neither Caid *et al.* nor Cudd *et al.* compares *web crawler analysis of the plurality of web pages to results obtained via monitoring data from one or more feeds,* as afforded by independent claim 39.

Moreover, claim 23 depends from independent claim 21 and claim 30 depends from independent claim 26. As noted above, Manber *et al.* and Caid *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all aspects of claims 21 and 26, and Cudd *et al.* fails to compensate for these deficiencies. Accordingly this rejection with respect to independent claims 21, 26 and 39 (and the claims that depend therefrom), should be withdrawn.

VII.   Rejection of Claim 24 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber *et al.* further in view of Caid, *et al.* and further in view of O'Brien, *et al.* Claim 24 depends from independent claim 21. As discussed *supra* with respect to claim 21, Manber *et al.* and Caid *et al.* fail to teach all limitations of claim 21; and O'Brien *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies. Accordingly this rejection should be withdrawn.

VIII.   Rejection of Claim 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber *et al.* further in view of Caid *et al.,* and further in view of Foster *et al.* Claim 27 depends from independent claim 26, and as discussed *supra* with respect to claim 26, Manber *et al.* and Caid *et al.* fail to teach all aspects of the subject claim. Foster *et al.* fails to compensate for these

deficiencies of Manber *et al.* and Caid *et al.* with regard to independent claim 26. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

IX.   Rejection of Claims 32-36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber *et al.* further in view of Caid *et al.*, and further in view of Brown *et al.* (US 6,356,908). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons.

Independent claims 26 and 34 recite similar limitations, namely *disposing a thumbnail reference on a portion of the at least one current web page, the thumbnail reference provides access to a version of the at least one current web page prior to removal of the one or more sections*. In an attempt to compensate for the deficiencies of Manber *et al.* and Caid *et al.*, the Examiner provides Brown *et al.* (US 6,356,908). In particular, the Examiner erroneously contends that Brown *et al.* teaches *adding a thumbnail reference to the preview version comprising an image of the at least one current web page in its original state*. Brown *et al.* discloses a method for presenting content from a page in a distributed database. In particular, Brown *et al.* provides thumbnail images adjacent to corresponding links to separate locations in an associated database. Thus, Brown *et al.* does not provide a thumbnail image of a *current web page* prior to any type of user-defined modification as in the claimed invention. As an example to further illustrate this distinction, the claimed invention provides a thumbnail reference to the unmodified version of the web page that has been subsequently modified to exclude non-essential material deemed not desirable to a user. Hence, by *adding a thumbnail reference to the preview version comprising an image of the at least one current web page in its original state*, the claimed invention provides a thumbnail of the *same* web page prior to modification rather than *links to disparate web pages* as taught by Brown *et al.* As a consequence, Brown *et al.* is silent regarding *adding a thumbnail reference to the preview version comprising an image of the at least one current web page in its original state*.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that the cited references fail to teach or suggest all aspects of independent claim 26 and 34 (and the claims that depend therefrom). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited. In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP513US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731